



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,795	11/16/2001	Phillip Y. Goldman	14531.124	8854

47973 7590 06/08/2006

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,795

Applicant(s)

GOLDMAN, PHILLIP Y.

Examiner

Sumaiya A. Chowdhury

Art Unit

2623

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1-16-02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 7, 10-11, 14-16, 19, 24, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Daniels (US 2002/0032907).

As for claim 1, Daniels teaches in a computing device having an associated output device, a method for automatically executing an interruption operation on media content in response to an event, comprising the acts of:

as media content (TV program) is obtained and output by the output device, detecting a first event (selection of advertiser's information page) indicating that the output of the media content is to be modified (paused) – [0021], [0080], [0081], [0161];

in response to detecting the first event, automatically executing an operation (pausing of TV program) on the media content such that the output of the media content is modified and can be later restored without loss of continuity of the media output – [0081], [0160], [0161].

As for claims 7 and 24, Daniels teaches wherein the act of detecting the first event comprises the act of detecting a signal from a device (remote control) associated with a home network (The viewer selects content using a remote control – [0021], [0112], [0120]).

Claims 10 and 11 contains the claim limitations of claim 1 and are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

As for claim 14, Daniels teaches wherein the act of automatically executing an operation on the media content comprises the act of automatically executing an operation (pause) on the media content such that the output of the media content is interrupted and can be later resumed without loss of continuity of the media output. – [0021], [0081], [0160], [0161]

As for claim 15, Daniels teaches in response to a second event (user selection to return to TV program), resuming the output of the media content – [0022], [0160].

Claim 16 contains the limitations of claims 1, 14, and 15, and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claim 19, Daniels teaches in a computing device having an associated display device and an associated storage device, a method of automatically pausing the

display of a television program in response to an event in the environment of the computing device, comprising the acts of:

as the television program is obtained and displayed on the display device, detecting a first event (selection of advertiser's information page) that has been designated to indicate that the display of the television program is to be interrupted - [0021], [0080], [0081], [0161];

in response to the detected event, automatically storing a television signal in which the television is encoded on the storage device (14) so as to pause the display of the television program (The TV program is recorded – [0021], [0095]);

in response to a second event (user selection to return to TV program), resuming display of the television signal by displaying the television signal that has been stored on the storage device - [0022], [0160].

As for claim 37, Daniels teaches a computer program product for implementing, in a computing device having an associated output device, a method for automatically executing an interruption operation on media content in response to an event, the computer program product comprising:

a computer-readable medium (24 – Fig. 1, [0095]) carrying computer-executable instructions that, when executed at the computing device, cause the computing device to perform the method, including the acts of:

as media content is obtained and output by the output device, detecting a first event (selection of advertiser's information page) indicating that the output of the media content is to be modified (paused) - [0021], [0080], [0081], [0161];;

in response to detecting the first event, automatically executing an operation on the media content such that the output of the media content is modified and can be later restored without loss of continuity of the media output – [0081], [0160], [0161].

Claim 38 contains the limitations of claims 19 and 37 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1/19 above, and further in view of McLaughlin (5,553,311).

As for claims 2 and 20, Daniels fails to teach wherein the act of detecting the first event comprises the act of detecting a ring signal on a telephone line.

In an analogous art, McLaughlin teaches wherein playback of content is interrupted when a telephone call is detected such that the user can receive the phone call – col. 13, lines 53-65, col. 14, lines 37-47.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels's invention to include playback of content is interrupted when a telephone call is detected, as taught by McLaughlin, for the advantage of allowing the user to receive the phone call.

5. Claims 3 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1/19 above, and further in view of Palmer (US 2001/0038690).

As for claims 3 and 21, Daniels fails to teach the act of detecting the first event comprises the act of detecting an off-hook condition of a telephone.

In an analogous art, Palmer teaches that an off-hook condition of a telephone automatically triggers the pausing of currently displayed content such that the user does not miss any content– [0063].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include that an off-hook condition of a telephone automatically triggers the pausing of currently displayed content, as taught by Palmer, for the advantage of allowing the user to not miss any content.

Art Unit: 2623

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels in view of Palmer as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Wong (5631745).

As for claim 4, Daniels and Palmer fail to teach wherein the act of detecting an off-hook condition of a telephone comprises the act of testing the impedance of a telephone line associated with the telephone.

In an analogous art, Wong discloses wherein the off-hook condition is detected by testing the impedance – col. 16, lines 22-25.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels and Palmer's invention to include wherein the off-hook condition is detected by testing the impedance, as taught by Wong, for the advantage of determining when a user has begun a conversation with the caller.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Goldman (4995074).

As for 5, Daniels fails to teach wherein the act of detecting the first event comprises the act of detecting a call waiting signal on a telephone line.

In an analogous art, Goldman discloses detecting a call waiting signal – col. 4, lines 43-61

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include detecting a call waiting signal, as taught by Goldman, for the advantage of informing the user of a third party call.

8. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1/19 above, and further in view of Mizutome (6,943,845).

As for claims 6 and 23, Daniels fails to teach the act of detecting the first event comprises the act of detecting receipt of an electronic message.

In an analogous art, Mizutome teaches detecting receipt of an e-mail (Fig. 17B, col. 12, lines 55-60) for the advantage of notifying the user that e-mail has arrived.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include detecting receipt of an e-mail, as taught by Mizutome, for the advantage of notifying the user that e-mail has arrived.

9. Claim 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tetsumura (5793409).

As for claims 8 and 9, Daniels fails to teach wherein the act of detecting the first event comprises the act of detecting a signal from a motion sensor and personal transmitter.

In an analogous art, Tetsumura teaches detecting a signal from the area sensor (motion sensor and personal transmitter) in order to automatically execute a function – col. 6, lines 27-36.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include detecting a signal from the area sensor, as taught by Tetsumura, for the advantage of automatically executing a function.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of O'Callaghan (5594492).

As for claim 12, Daniels teaches wherein the act of detecting a first event indicating that the output of the media content is to be modified comprises the act of, as television programming is received from a server (Fig. 8) and output by the output device (44 – Fig. 2), detecting a first event (selection of advertiser's information page) indicating that the output of the television programming is to be interrupted ([0021], [0080], [0081], [0161]).

However, Daniels fails to teach that the server is a video on demand server.

In an analogous art, O'Callaghan teaches a video on demand server (404 – Fig. 4) for the advantage of allowing the user to view selected content instantaneously – col. 6, lines 36-45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include a video on demand server, as taught by O'Callaghan, for the advantage of allowing the user to view selected content instantaneously.

11. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels and O'Callaghan as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Jennings (US 2004/0025186).

As for claim 13, Daniels fails to teach wherein the act of detecting a first event indicating that the output of the television programming is to be interrupted comprises the act of transmitting a signal from the computing device to the video on demand server indicating that the output of the television programming is to be interrupted by the video on demand server.

In an analogous art, Jennings discloses wherein a signal is transmitted from the receiver to the media server (510 – Fig. 5; video on demand server) indicating to pause the content for the advantage of having the operation done at the server end rather than the receiver to keep the functions carried out by the receiver to a minimum– paragraph [0199].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include wherein a signal is transmitted from the receiver to the media server indicating to pause the content, as taught by Jennings, for the advantage of having the operation done at the server end rather than the receiver to keep the functions carried out by the receiver to a minimum.

12. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schindler (5675390).

As for claims 17 and 18, Daniels fails to teach the act of displaying a message associated with detection of the first event and wherein the act of displaying a message associated with detection of the first event comprises the act of displaying caller ID data associated with an incoming telephone call.

In an analogous art, Schindler teaches when a user receives a phone call, a message appears on the display with the identity of the calling source in order to inform the user of the calling source – col. 17, lines 42-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include when a user receives a phone call, a message appears on the display with the identity of the calling source, as taught by Schindler, for the advantage of informing the user of the calling source.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels and Palmer as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Kilby (3777067).

As for claim 22, Daniels and Palmer fail to disclose wherein the off-hook condition is detected immediately after a ring signal on a telephone line associated with the telephone.

In an analogous art, Kilby discloses wherein the off-hook condition is detected after a ring signal on a telephone line for the advantage of transmitting a busy signal to the calling party such that the user isn't disturbed – col. 7, lines 5-30.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels and Pamler's invention to include wherein the off-hook condition is detected after a ring signal on a telephone line, as taught by Kilby, for the advantage of transmitting a busy signal to the calling party such that the user isn't disturbed.

14. Claims 25, 28, 30-34, 36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels in view of Yen (6,668,278).

As for claim 25, Daniels teaches in a computing device having an interruption engine and an associated output device, a method for automatically executing an interruption operation on media content in response to an event, comprising the acts of:

as media content is received and output by the output device, detecting an event (selection of advertiser's information page) in the environment of the computing device - [0021], [0080], [0081], [0161];

automatically executing the interruption operation on the media content – [0081], [0160], [0161].

However, Daniels fails to teach:

identifying a priority value to be assigned to the event based on priority information stored at the computing device;

applying a rule of a set of rules to the priority value assigned to the event to identify an interruption operation;

In an analogous art, Yen teaches:

a) identifying a priority value to be assigned to the event based on priority information stored at the computing device – col. 12, lines 7-32;

b) applying a rule of a set of rules to the priority value assigned to the event to identify an interruption operation – col. 12, lines 7-32;

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels' invention to include steps a) & b), as taught by Yen, for the advantage of allowing the user to set at what instances to be interrupted.

As for claim 28, Daniels and Yen discloses the claimed limitations. In particular, Daniels teaches wherein the act of detecting the event comprises the act of receiving information via an input mechanism (remote control) that was established for interrupt

sources to inform the interruption engine (processor) that the output of media content (TV program) is to be interrupted (paused) - [0021], [0112], [0120].

As for claim 30, Daniels and Yen discloses the claimed limitations. In particular, Yen teaches the act of receiving data that was registered with the interruption engine by a user, wherein the data defines the set of rules (The user explicitly specifies the alert threshold for interruption for each event. – col. 12, lines 7-32).

As for claims 31 and 36, Daniels and Yen teach the claimed limitations. In particular, Daniels teaches wherein the interruption operation is such that the output of the media content is paused as discussed above in claim 1.

As for claim 32, Daniels and Yen disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Yen teaches the act of the interruption engine learning the behavior of a viewer associated with the computing device so as to generate the information on which the priority value to be assigned to the event is based (col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 12, lines 16-37).

As for claim 33, Daniels and Yen disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Yen teaches the act of the interruption engine learning the behavior of a viewer associated with the computing device so as to generate the rule of the set of rules(col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 12, lines 16-37).

As for claim 34, Daniels and Yen disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Yen teaches wherein the act of applying a rule of a set of rules to the priority value comprises the act of further applying an exception to the rule (Yen teaches where interruption occurs depending on the type of content being viewed by the user. For example, interrupting while viewing email as opposed to interrupting a TV show or movie – col. 12, lines 15-26).

15. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels and Yen as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of McLaughlin.

As for claim 26, Daniels and Yen fail to teach wherein the act of detecting the event comprises the act of determining that a telephone call is being received.

In an analogous art, McLaughlin teaches wherein playback of content is interrupted when a telephone call is detected such that the user can receive the phone call – col. 13, lines 53-65, col. 14, lines 37-47.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels and Yen's invention to include playback of content is interrupted when a telephone call is detected, as taught by McLaughlin, for the advantage of allowing the user to receive the phone call.

16. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels and Yen as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Mizutome (6,943,845).

As for claim 27, Daniels and Yen fails to teach detecting the receipt of an electronic message.

In an analogous art, Mizutome teaches detecting receipt of an e-mail (Fig. 17B, col. 12, lines 55-60) for the advantage of notifying the user that e-mail has arrived.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels and Yen's invention to include detecting receipt of an e-mail, as taught by Mizutome, for the advantage of notifying the user that e-mail has arrived.

17. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels and Yen as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Block (6,675,384).

As for claim 29, Daniels and Yen fails to teach receiving the set of rules in broadcast data encoded in a television signal.

In an analogous art, Block teaches that the label generator (170 – Fig. 2) provides a transmitted information label TIL for transmission with the programs signals. The TIL is used to identify and characterize the content of the audio and video program

signals (col. 4, lines 47-52). Based on the TIL encoded in the program signal, the content is either blocked or displayed to the viewer (col. 13, lines 23-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels and Yen's invention to include receiving the set of rules in broadcast data encoded in a television signal, as taught by Block, for the advantage of having the headend determine what is objectionable or not to the viewer.

18. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels and Yen as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of O'Callaghan.

As for claim 35, Yen teaches applying a rule of a set of rules to the priority value (col. 12, lines 7-32). However, Daniels and Yen fail to teach a video on demand server

In an analogous art, O'Callaghan teaches a video on demand server (404 – Fig. 4) for the advantage of allowing the user to view selected content instantaneously – col. 6, lines 36-45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Daniels and Yen's invention to include a video on demand server, as taught by O'Callaghan, for the advantage of allowing the user to view selected content instantaneously.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAC


CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600